

reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." That is the way to do it; let us adopt it. It is the "Bible alone plan," and therefore should be ours. If we pursue this method, no harm will come from discussion through the EVANGELIST, but on the contrary, a deeper interest will be awakened in the study of God's word and the affairs of the church.

Starting out in this line right now, is not Brother Gnagey mistaken when he says, "Formerly it was believed by the whole Dunkard fraternity, that the doctrine of the Lord's Supper as a *full meal* rested entirely on a certain, fixed day on which the Jewish passover was to be observed, and that to give up this "certain" day was to give up the idea of the Lord's Supper," or don't I understand him correctly? I have been in the fraternity a long time and never held that view and never knew anybody else that did. I have heard it stated that if that was the Jewish passover which Christ did (or did not) eat, just before he suffered death, and in connection with which he did (or did not) institute the Lord's Supper then we have no (or have) foundation for a full meal as the Lord's Supper. The proposition is that if it was the Passover it was *not* the Lord's Supper, and *vice versa*. A "certain" day was "fixed" for the keeping of the Jewish Passover; I never heard that disputed. But perhaps I don't understand the brother; I'll wait and see before I say more. In the meanwhile, if good brethren or sisters have something good to say in a good way, on the controverted subject, I will patiently read it, if I have not read it a dozen or so times before. But candidly, I do not believe there is as much desire for that kind of reading matter as there is for opportunity to expatiate. In this too, I may be mistaken.

I do not like the habit many of the brethren have fallen into, of the use of the term "Rev." It sounds so silly to me. I do wish we could avoid vain and useless habits among us. I do not suppose it is sinful, but it is so vain and trifling and unnecessary.

A THOUGHT ON FEET-WASHING.

JOHN CRAWFORD MACKEY.

The 13th chapter of John furnishes a simple narrative—one easily understood. Jesus was with his disciples, seated at the table, on which was spread the supper. With intentional silence, he arises from his reclining couch, laid aside his mantle and girded himself with a towel—poured water into a basin and began to wash and wipe the disciple's feet. This singular service proceeded with beautiful order, until the Master came to Peter. Peter

hesitates. Jesus endeavors to assure him that while he may not now know the meaning of the act about to be performed, he will by and by. But Peter remonstrates. Then Jesus tells him plainly that unless he submit he shall have no part with him. Peter, with characteristic impetuosity, replies, "Lord not my feet only, but my hands and my head." Jesus says, "He that is washed is clean and need only to wash his feet." And Peter yields.

After the service had been concluded, Jesus asked his disciples if they knew what he had done, and proceeds to tell them, that he was their Lord and Master, and that as he had washed their feet, giving them an example, so ought they to wash one another's feet. Thus interpreting his act and instituting the ordinance.

During the Old Testament times, and also in the New, in Bible lands, the washing of feet for purposes of cleanliness was quite common. The peculiar foot gear worn by the people, making it necessary to do so frequently. It was customary, too, for friends or nurses to wash the feet of the sick, when such service was needed or required.

But the washing of feet, passing these ordinary usages, entered also into the religious formularies of the Jew. An instance of this sort is seen in the ceremonies of the Temple. Here was the Holy place in which were the shew bread, the great candlestick with its seven branches, and the altar or incense; and the most Holy place where were kept the mercy-seat, the cherubum, the ark and books of the law. Now, when the priest went daily into the Holy place, and the high priest yearly into the most Holy place to minister before God, they were required to wash their hands and their feet.

Our Lord, however, in instituting the New Testament ordinance, appeared to catch the idea from a more common custom of the Jew. The Hebrews had their baths, or place of ablution, built some distance from their dwellings. To these baths they would repair and wash. So careful were they that every part of their bodies should be cleansed, that they dipped repeatedly, then fastened on their sandals and returned to their homes. On the way thither, their feet necessarily became soiled with the dust, so, when they reached their dwellings, they would remove their sandals and rewash *only their feet*. How natural the allusion: "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet but is clean every whit."

The purpose of the supper is to remind us that we are "all one in Christ," and should love each other as members of a

common family, the Master, Jesus Christ, our divine Head. The bread and the cup constitute the memorials of Christ's broken body and shed blood. We call this the holy communion. It is the bow of the New Testament, one arm of the great arch resting on the personal departure of the Savior, and the other resting on his personal coming again. "Ye do shew forth the Lord's death till he come." The washing of feet tells us that while we are really children of God, regenerated by the Holy Spirit, in coming in daily contact with the world, we cannot fail to contract the stain, and so need renewed applications of the blood of Christ to cleanse from all polluting taints. He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet but is clean every whit."

While we live by faith under the bow of the New Testament, remembering the death of Jesus for our sins, and looking earnestly for his coming again, may we, also, recognizing the unhappy divisions now existing between churches and Christians, gather around a common table, at stated times, observing at least the type of that glorious reunion by and by; and with repentance toward God, may we confess our sins, and as we, after the command, institution and example of the blessed Christ, wash each others feet, shall we not acknowledge the necessity of being again and again washed in the precious blood of Jesus, "which cleanseth from all sin."

Dearly beloved Brethren, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

REVIEW ITEMS.

J. O. TALLEY.

We read EVANGELIST No. 25, "Holsingerisms," with profound interest and edification. Amen! Brother Holsinger, but so long as our G. B. brethren keep side-tracking at each annual meeting station, I am afraid they will not catch up, unless peradventure they can make up for lost time between stations. But that might prove hazardous, and end in a wreck.

But, however, with better lubrication, and machinery that is being rapidly improved and power full, I notice they do not have so many *hot* bases, and soon they will not stop at all, and with a long pull, if the fire of the engine of love is kept burning brightly, they will be ready and hook on by-and-by, Brother Holsinger.

The recent editorial on a "free rostrum" expresses my sentiment exactly.

Logical investigation, scholarly comparison, lofty spiritual conceptions should not be classed with the purely speculative criticism. Else soon our preacher would be kept busy in the pulpit replying to papers that appear in our periodicals.